20

21

22

23

24

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

96127

Box 3030, Susanville, CA

Marc Dawson

v.

filed the instant civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging prison medical staff violated his constitutional right to receive medical treatment along with the right to be free of deliberate indifference from the same medical staff.

25

26

27

28

DISCUSSION

The Plaintiff must state a cognizable claim which relief may be granted by the court. The Plaintiff must show that a right secured by the Constitution or law of the United States was violated and that the violations were committed under the

Dawson v. Latham, et al. No. C 08-0741 JF (PR)

color of state law.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

In the order dated 5/8/08, the Honorable Judge Jeremy Fogel, after reviewing the Plaintiff's complaint, determined that there was not a cognizable claim for actions against Defendants MORGAN, MCLEAN, and THACKER for appeal related issues in that there is no Constituional right to a prison administrative appeal or grievance system. Rameriz v. Galaza, 334 F.3d 850, 860 (9th. Cir. 2003).

The Plaintiff's inclusion of Defendants MORGAN, MCLEAN, and THACKER relied on Due Process violations in regards to the grievance system and procedures. At the federal level, this Due Process violation does not exist.

The doctrine of respondent superior does not apply in this complaint. That MORGAN, MCLEAN, and THACKER were in superior positions, they were not directly liable, or responsible for the harm done by Defendants LATHAM, EDWARDS, and JAIN. With no direct involvement in the alleged incident, and the Plaintiffs interaction after the fact with MORGAN, MCLEAN, and THACKER, they could not provide any actions which would correct the actions of the staff members that they relied on the judgment and competence of.

In respecting the judgment of this court, the Plaintiff does not desire to waste this courts time by pursuing matters that cannot state a cognizable claim for relief on by the Plaintiff. The actions against MORGAN, MCLEAN, and THACKER cannot, and will not be allowed to continue once the issues are reviewed by this court.

CONCLUSION

Due to the above-stated reasons this motion to dismiss actions against Defendants MORGAN, MCLEAN, and THACKER be granted.

DECLARATION

The Plaintiff, Marc Dawson, hereby enters this motion freely and all of the issues are true to the best of his knowledge.

/s/

Dated: June 16th, 2008.

Marc Dawson, in pro per and pro se

28

